

REMARKS

Claims 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is overcome by amending claims 16, 18 and 20 to include a determination of the electromagnetic radiation in the computer system.

Claims 1, 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Namiki* (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0099510) in view of *Treiber et al.* (U.S. 6,664,463) and further in view of *Visser et al.* ("Minimization of heat sink mass using Mathematical Optimization", IEEE 2000), *Remsburg et al.* (U.S. 5,804,875), *Houghton et al.* (U.S. 6,282,095) and *Fleischhauer et al.* (U.S. 5,591,368). Claims 6-8, 11 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Namiki* in view of *Treiber et al.* and further in view of *Visser et al.*, *Remsburg et al.*, *Houghton et al.*, *Fleischhauer et al.* and *Fox* (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0089449). Applicants traverse these rejections on the grounds that these references are defective in establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

As the PTO recognizes in MPEP § 2142:

...The Examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness. If the Examiner does not produce a *prima facie* case, the Applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness....the Examiner must step backward in time and into the shoes worn by the hypothetical 'person of ordinary skill in the art' when the invention was unknown and just before it was made....The Examiner must put aside knowledge of the Applicant's disclosure, refrain from using hindsight, and consider the subject matter claimed 'as a whole.'"

The present invention claims in claims 1, 6, 10, 16, 18 and 20: ...determining current loop length defined by a current path over a surface of the heat sink and adjusting the current loop length by adjusting one or more of, the number of fins, the number of bars, and the fin geometry...

The references do not teach or suggest determining current loop length defined by a current path over a surface of the heat sink and adjusting the current loop length by adjusting one or more of, the number of fins, the number of bars, and the fin geometry.

The Federal Circuit has, on many occasions, held that there was no basis for combining references to support a 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection. For example, in *In re Geiger*, the court stated in holding that the PTO “failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness”:

Obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion or incentive supporting the combination. *ACS Hospital Systems, Inc. v. Monteffiore Hospital*, 732 F.2d 1572, 1577, 221 USPQ 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

The Federal Circuit has also repeatedly warned against using the applicant’s disclosure as a blueprint to reconstruct the claimed invention out of isolated teachings in the prior art. See, e.g., *Grain Processing Corp. v. American Maize-Products*, 840 F.2d 902, 907, 5 USPQ2d 1798, 1792 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

More recently, the Federal Circuit found motivation absent in *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 47 USPQ2d 1453 (Fed. Cir. 1998). In this case, the court concluded that the board had “reversibly erred in determining that one of [ordinary] skill in the art would have been motivated to combine these references in a manner that

rendered the claimed invention [to have been] obvious.” The court noted that to “prevent the use of hindsight based on the invention to defeat patentability of the invention, this court requires the examiner to show a motivation to combine the references that create the case of obviousness.” The court further noted that there were three possible sources for such motivation, namely “(1) the nature of the problem to be solved; (2) the teachings of the prior art; and (3) the knowledge of persons of ordinary skill in the art.” Here, according to the court, the board had relied simply upon “the high level of skill in the art to provide the necessary motivation,” without explaining what specific understanding or technological principle within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art would have suggested the combination. Notably, the court wrote: “If such a rote invocation could suffice to supply a motivation to combine, the more sophisticated scientific fields would rarely, if ever, experience a patentable technical advance.”

Therefore, there is simply no basis in the art for combining the references to support a 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection because the references do not teach or even suggests the desirability of the combination. Moreover, neither patent provides any incentive or motivation supporting the desirability of the combination.

The MPEP §2143.01 provides:

The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Therefore, the Examiner's combination arises solely from hindsight based on the invention without any showing of suggestion, incentive or motivation in either reference for the combination.

Thus, the Examiner's burden of factually supporting a *prima facie* case of obviousness has clearly not been met.

Therefore, independent claims 1, 6, 10, 16, 18 and 20 and the claims dependent therefrom are submitted to be allowable.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, 11 and 16-20 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


James R. Bell
Registration No. 26,528

Dated: 1-25-05
HAYNES AND BOONE, L.L.P.
901 Main Street, Suite 3100
Dallas, Texas 75202-3789
Telephone: 512/867-8407
Facsimile: 214/200-0853
ipdocketing@haynesboone.com

A-172841_1.DOC

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.	
on	<u>1/25/05</u>
Date	<u>MAZ</u>
Signature	<u>NISHI BASARNA</u>
Typed or Printed name of person signing Certificate	